

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/498,135		STONE, JOHN F.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Jeanine A Enewold Goldberg		1655	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jeanine A Enewold Goldberg.

(3) Cindy Pillote.

(2) Lisa Arthur.

(4) Dr. John Stone.

Date of Interview: 09 November 2000.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Dr. John Stone explained the invention as being directed to the analyzation of fragments whithin interphase nuclei. Dr. Stone, when asked, stated that the inventive nature of the claims was not directed to "diseases for which chromosome damage is diagnostic" nor new "chromosome damaging agents". Thus, the inventive nature of the claims is to the analysis in interphase cells. An amendment directed to this feature was proposed. Furthermore, the 112/2nd issue regarding the preamble meeting the final process step was discussed. Examiner Arthur explained that the claim does not make sense as written. For example, the method does not compare the fragments to a normal to determine the increase fragmentation. The attorney expressed the concern of limiting, however, the exminer explained the method is not complete without such a step. As a result of the interview, the examiner agreed to entertain a supplemental amendment provided the amendment was faxed on Monday, November 13, 2000.